REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his findings and conclusions.

It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend Claims 1, 13 and

5   24 solely for the purpose of expediting the patent process in a manner consistent with

the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00).   In making such

amendments, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection

to which the Applicant considers the invention herein entitled.   Rather, Applicant

reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely

10   seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Hilton Davis / Festo Statement

The amendments to Claims 1, 13 and 24 herein were not made for any reason

related to patentability. The amendments to Claims 1, 13, and 24 were implemented to

clarify the invention.   The foregoing amendments are not related to the pending

15   rejections; all amendments were made for reasons other than patentability.

Applicant notes that the Office Action dated 10/4/06 was final.   Applicant

respectfully notes that response dated July 24, 2006 (the response which proceeded

the Office Action dated 10/4/06) was a first response averring common ownership of the

pending application and the reference over which the claims were rejected under 35

20   U.S.C. § 102(e). The response dated July 24, 2006 did not amend the claims. In the

Office Action dated 10/4/06, the Examiner uses *new* prior art to reject the unamended

claims. Therefore, the finality of the Office Action dated 10/4/06 is not improprer, as per

MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the finality

of the rejection, and enter the amendments to the claims submitted herein, as well as consider the art submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement attached herewith.

All pending claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in light of a hypothetical combination of Gupta and Kerr. Applicant respectfully disagrees

5   with this rejection. Each independent claim as amended recites "maintaining a database [containing] user specific information...comprising at least a username and passwords associated with... [a] user...obtaining a blank form...automatically parsing said blank form to identify which of the user specific information should be used to fill in at least a part of said blank form...and automatically submitting the [completed form]...

10   to a second computer server."

In other words, information concerning users is stored in a database. When a user attempts to engage in an Internet activity that necessitates filling out a form that contains user specific information (e.g., logging into an account on a web merchant or email server, or completing an electronic survey), information concerning the user is

15   automatically extracted from the database and parsed, so that the form is automatically filled out with the user specific information and submitted. This saves the user the trouble of having to a) remember or write down and carry account specific information for a plurality of accounts, and b) manually enter user specific information into Internet forms such as logon screens.

20   Neither Gupta nor Kerr, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest these recited limitations. Gupta describes data mining from web pages that require filling out forms to access the data contained therein (e.g., entering data in a search query, or entering a range of dates of interest). In Gupta, special wrapper programs submit data

to the form to retrieve the broadest possible results (i.e., the most data), so as to be able to mine as much of the data contained in the page as possible. For example, whenever a form asks a question such as "what data are you interested in?" the wrapper fill out the form with "any." (See col. 10, lines 12-57 and Figure 3A).

5   Thus, Gupta does not disclose storing user specific data, extracting it and automatically parsing and filling out web forms as a user wants them filled out, for example so as to log onto an email server. Instead, Gupta discloses wrapper programs that fill out web forms such as search templates to return broad results for data mining.

Kerr, on the other hand, discusses storing login sequences associated with

10   specific, known URLs. When a user attempts to logon to a known URL, Kerr seeds the login screen with the specific stored login sequence associated with that known URL. Nothing in Kerr discloses automatically parsing a blank form to identify which of the user specific information should be used to complete it. In fact, in Kerr, if the specific login sequence for a known URL is not stored (or is invalid or expired), the user must login to

15   that site manually. (See col. 5, lines 1-14).

For the record, Applicant respectfully posits that there exists no motivation to combine Gupta and Kerr, as they are in completely separate technology areas (data mining and password management), and solve completely separate problems (how to mine the most data from web sites where data is accessed via forms, such as search

20   queries, and how to automate logon to known URLs with known login sequences). However, even if Gupta and Kerr were to be combined, the hypothetical combination would at best yield a wrapper program for data mining that could automatically logon to

known URLs with known login sequences. This would still fail to disclose the limitations of the pending claims discussed above.

All claims other than 1, 13 and 24 depend therefrom, and thus should be allowable at least for the same reasons.

5

In view of the above, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all outstanding rejections, allowing the Application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, he is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's attorney at (650) 474-8400.

10

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Brill

Reg. No. 51,198

15

Customer No. 22,862

11